

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended, and claims 1, 3 and 4 remain pending in the application.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1, 3 and 4 contain allowable subject matter.

Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the rejection, the Examiner asserts the structure of the tray is not clearly set forth as follows:

- 1) How is the rotary member "interconnected" with the connecting groove of the connecting member?
- 2) How is the damper configured to be rotated with a uniform?
- 3) The limitations of the latch, the guide rail and the guide protrusion are broadly recited and provide no specific structure.
- 4) It is unclear how a recovery force is used to rotate the rotary member when the door is opened since there is no preceding limitation of a resilient member or other structure requiring a force?
- 5) From what source does the recovery force initiate?

In response, claim 1 has been amended to address the issues raised by the Examiner. For example, claim 1 has been amended to delete “interconnected” and to more clearly recite the rotary member; claim 1 has further been amended to delete “a uniform”; claim 1 has further been amended to more clearly define the latch, the guide rail and the guide protrusion; claim 1 has further been amended to delete “recovery” and to more clearly define the resilient member; and claim 1 has further been amended to more clearly recite the resilient member.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims as amended are definite, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Independent claim 1 is now believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the amendments and the above-noted remarks. Dependent claims 3 and 4 are also submitted to be in condition for allowance in view of their dependence from the allowable base claim and also at least based upon their recitations of additional features of the present invention. It is respectfully requested, therefore, that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraphs, be withdrawn and that an early indication of the allowance of all of the pending claims be given.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to be attached thereto.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Young-seok KIM



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

Daniel B. Moon
Reg. No. 48,214

July 7, 2008
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191